

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/791,141	03/02/2004	Kevin I. Bertness	C382.12-0178	3178	
27367 WESTMAN C	7590 06/10/200 HAMPLIN & KELLY,	EXAMINER			
SUITE 1400			PIGGUSH, AARON C		
900 SECOND MINNEAPOL	AVENUE SOUTH IS MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	10, 1111 00 102		2858	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/10/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/791,141	BERTNESS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Aaron Piggush	2858	

	Aaron Piggush	2858					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 02 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. So The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, which no event, however, will be statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (a) above; if checket. A vry reply received by the Office later than three months after the malling date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any sermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require (tinther consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•					
	7. Some purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4.9-43.45.47-54.56.109 and 111-114. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
/Edward Tso/							
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2858					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: New issues include the use of the phrase "is a function of" when referring to the starter test being a function of a result of the battery test and the charging system test result being a function of the result of the battery test. Furthermore, the amendment would not materially reduce or simplify the issues in a potential appeal.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the applicant's clarification regarding the terms "based upon" and "a function of" (referring to the starter test and charging system test being based upon or a function of the battery test), the Gollump reference is still seen as meeting the claim language presented. Please see the citations provided previously (emphasis on pages 2-4 of the prior office action), wherein Gollump's tests include the use of a battery test result in the starter st(Fig. 2A/B, abstract) and charging system test (Fig. 2A/B, abstract) and charging system test (Fig. 4A/B, abstract), at clearing the starter and charging system will at least implicitly include some battery test result (i.e. in order to determine if the batter van deliver charme for the starter and if the batter via acception charge from the charging system).